


Appln No. 09/882,351
Amdt date August 30, 2005
Reply to Office action of April 1, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the final Office action dated April 1, 2005, the examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 7-14 and 17-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Rourke, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,720,910) in view of either Shackle (U.S. Patent No. 6,174,623) or Amano, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,235,433). However, applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 14 to recite that the second conductive polymer is selected from the group consisting of polyethylene glycol, derivatives thereof and salts thereof, and has canceled claims 7 and 23. None of Rourke, Shackle or Amano teach or suggest the use of polyethylene glycol or its derivatives or salts, as currently claimed. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that now pending claims 1, 2, 4, 8-14 and 17-22 are allowable over Rourke, Shackle and Amano.

In light of the above remarks, applicant submits that all of pending claims 1, 2, 4, 8-14 and 17-22, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests a timely indication of allowance. However, if there are any remaining issues that can best be addressed by telephone, applicant asks the examiner to contact applicant's attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 
David A. Plumley
Reg. No. 37,208
626/795-9900

LES/les
RJL PAS640556.1-*08/30/05 2:46 PM